

PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION

HISTORIC BRIDGES

PROJECT NUMBER J4I1507 RTE. I-29/I-35 COUNTY Jackson/Clay

SECTION 4(f) RESOURCE Paseo Bridge

REVIEWED BY Peggy J. Casey TITLE Env. Projects Engineer

APPROVED BY  DATE 11-06-2006

This project and its impacts have been determined to meet the following criteria for a Programmatic Section 4(f). Sufficient documentation exists in the project file to support this determination. Note: Any response in a bracket requires additional information prior to approval. Consult Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation signed July 5, 1983 by FHWA's Office of Environmental Policy.

APPLICABILITY

- |  | Yes      | No       |
|--|----------|----------|
| 1. Will the bridge be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds?  | <u>X</u> | [ ]      |
| 2. Will the project require the "use" of an historic bridge which is on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? | <u>X</u> | [ ]      |
| 3. Will the project impair the historic integrity of the bridge either by demolition or rehabilitation?                                      | <u>X</u> | [ ]      |
| 4. Has the bridge been determined to be a National Historic Landmark?  | [ ]      | <u>X</u> |

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- |  |          |     |
|--|----------|-----|
| 1. The do nothing alternative has been studied and is considered not to be feasible and prudent for reasons of maintenance and safety. | <u>X</u> | [ ] |
|--|----------|-----|

- |   | Yes      | No  |
|---|----------|-----|
| 2. The building on new location alternative without using the old bridge has been studied and has been determined to be not feasible and prudent for reasons of terrain; and/or adverse social, economic or environmental effects; and/or engineering and economy. <u>X</u> | <u>X</u> | [ ] |
| 3. Rehabilitation of the existing bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge has been studied and has been determined to be not feasible and prudent for reasons of structural deficiency and/or geometrics. <u>X</u>                                    | <u>X</u> | [ ] |
| 4. Relocation of the existing bridge has been studied and found to be not feasible and prudent because either the bridge's historic integrity would be adversely affected or no responsible party could be found to accept responsibility for the bridge. <u>X</u>          | <u>X</u> | [ ] |

#### MEASURES TO MINIMIZE HARM

- |  |          |     |
|--|----------|-----|
| 1. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated, the historic integrity of the bridge is preserved, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with unavoidable transportation needs, safety, and load requirements. <u>X</u>   | <u>X</u> | [ ] |
| 2. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated to the point that the historic integrity is affected or that are to be moved or demolished, the FHWA has ensured that fully adequate records are made of the bridge in accordance with the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards, or other suitable means developed through consultation. <u>X</u> | <u>X</u> | [ ] |
| 3. For bridges that are to be replaced, the existing bridge is made available for an alternative use, provided a responsible party agrees to maintain and preserve the bridge. <u>X</u>  | <u>X</u> | [ ] |
| 4. For bridges that are adversely affected the FHWA, SHPO, and ACHP have reached agreement through the Section 106 process on Measures to Minimize Harm and those measures are incorporated in the project. <u>X</u>   | <u>X</u> | [ ] |